

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**W.P. NO. 317/ /2006****PETITIONER**

P.R. No. 3252/06
Presented by Shri Sameer Sahu
dated 30/6/06

Bandhu Lal Sahu, S/o. Shri Jugut Ram Sahu, aged about 46 years, R/o. Village Kodava, Post Sasaha, Palari, District Raipur (C.G.)

VERSUS**RESPONDENTS**

RECEIVED COPY
CLERK TO JUDGE BILASPUR
30/6/06

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through Secretary, Water Resources
Department, D.K.S. Bhavan,
Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Engineer in Chief,
Water Resources Department,
Raipur (C.G.)
3. Sub Divisional Officer,
Irrigation Construction Sub
Division, Baloda Bazar, District
Raipur (C.G.)

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE
NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, CERTIORARI ETC. OR
ANY OTHER DIRECTION OR ORDER TO DO JUSTICE IN THE
MATTER**

मामला क्रमांक W.P.3(91) सन् 2006

(38)

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	3-7-2006 Mr. Sunil Otwani, counsel for the petitioner. Miss Deepali Pandey, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents, on advance copy. Heard. The main grievance of the petitioner in this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is that he is working as Amin in the Irrigation Department. As per the Government policy, those Amins who had successfully completed ten years' tenure have to be regularized on the post of Amin. Accordingly a Committee for scrutinizing the service records of those Amins was constituted and ultimately regularizing the services of certain Amins the order Annexure P-7 dated 3rd January, 2003 was passed and the persons junior to the petitioner have been regularized whereas, the case of the petitioner was not considered and deliberately, the case of the petitioner was forwarded to the Screening Committee after the order Annexure P-7 was passed i.e. the case of the petitioner was forwarded on 14-1-2003, therefore, the case of the petitioner was not considered. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has made several representations to the respondents and last representation was made on 18-5-2006 to the Chief Engineer vide Annexure P-8, but in spite of the fact that the case of the petitioner was forwarded, the same is not being decided. Therefore, respondent No.2 be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents has no objection.	

मामला क्रमांक W.P. 3191/ सन् 2006

39

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश - 2 -	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
Soma	Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner in an objective manner, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, in accordance with law. However, if the representation sent by the petitioner is not available with respondent No.2, then he is at liberty to ask the petitioner to furnish a copy of the representation again and the petitioner will be at liberty to approach respondent No.2. With the direction aforesaid the petition stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.	Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge

5.4.06